

the above rejection to the extent the Examiner deems it applicable to pending claims 33-40.

Independent claims 33, 35, 37, and 39 patentably distinguish the invention from Damico. Claim 33, for example, defines a method for managing information using an intermediary gateway device having a corresponding network address. The method first receives a request to communicate with a network accessible datastore having a particular network address. The method then modifies the particular network address of the datastore to reflect the address of the intermediary gateway device. Finally, the method provides access to the network addressable datastore through the intermediary gateway device using the modified address of the network addressable datastore.

In contrast to the claimed invention, Damico provides a system for identifying and tracking web sites that refer users to a second web site. As shown in Fig. 1, Damico discloses a user station 102a coupled to a web site 122a having an address *www.cm1.com* (col. 5, lines 27-29). If a user clicks on an advertisement for an on-line service (OLS), then the system modifies the address of the OLS's web site 128 to include the address of site 122a (col. 5, lines 29-45). The system will then connect the user to web site 128 via the newly combined address, e.g., *www.ols.com/cm1/index.html*. In this way, the Damico system tracks those web pages referring users to the OLS's home web page 128 (col. 2, lines 47-50).

Damico fails to disclose or suggest, however, modifying a particular network address of a datastore to reflect the address of an intermediary gateway device, as recited in claims 33, 35, 37, and 39. As described above, Damico discloses modifying

the address of a datastore (e.g., OLS web site 128) to include the address of another datastore (e.g., web site 122a).

Further, Damico does not disclose or suggest providing access to a datastore through an intermediary gateway device using the modified address of the network addressable datastore, as also recited in claims 33, 35, 37, and 39. This follows from the fact that the Damico system does not allow the user to access OLS web site 128 via any other web site. The combined address only allows the user to communicate directly with OLS site 128 itself, albeit by identifying which web site referred the user to OLS site 128. Thus, the system does not allow a user to access OLS site 128 through an intermediary gateway device using the modified address. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Damico fails to disclose or suggest the invention of claims 33, 35, 37, and 39.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of pending claims 33-40.

To the extent any extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is required to obtain entry of this response, such extension is hereby requested. If there are any fees due under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or 1.17 which are not enclosed, including any fees required for an

extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136, please charge those fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

By: 

Timothy J. May
Reg. No. 41,538

Dated: January 13, 2000

00000000000000000000

LAW OFFICES

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON,
FARABOW, GARRETT,
& DUNNER, L.L.P.
1300 I STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20005
202-408-4000